

REMARKS

Claims 1-17 are pending in this application. Claim 1 is the only independent claim.

In the Office Action, claims 1-9 and 11-14 are rejected under the non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting doctrine as obvious over claims 1-12 of co-pending application Serial No. 10/871,003.

A Terminal Disclaimer is submitted with this paper. Accordingly, it is submitted that the rejection should be withdrawn.

Next, in the Office Action, claims 1-3, 8-9, and 11-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by US 2002/0084447A1 to Taguchi et al. ("Taguchi"), and claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Taguchi in view of WO2001/55753A to Ito et al. ("Ito").

The rejections are respectfully traversed. Taguchi discloses a film having dichromatic dye aggregates forming lyotropic liquid crystal phase, along with an optional polymer binder. However, in the film of Taguchi, the dye is in the aggregates, not in the binder.

In contrast, in the presently claimed invention, the polarizer comprises a monolayer film having a structure having a minute domain dispersed in a matrix formed of a translucent water-soluble resin including an iodine light absorbing material, as recited in present claim 1. This feature of the presently claimed invention and its advantages are not taught or suggested in Taguchi.

In particular, the aggregates described at paragraphs [0132]-[0135] of Taguchi are a dye component forming lyotropic liquid crystal, and the iodine described at paragraph [0043] of

Request for Reconsideration
Serial No. 10/681,384
Attorney Docket No. 032009

Taguchi is one of a substituent group of the dichromatic dye, so that they cannot correspond to a minute domain dispersed in a matrix including an iodine light absorbing material as in the presently claimed invention.

In summary, Taguchi fails to teach or suggest the features of the presently claimed invention, and Ito fails to remedy the deficiencies of Taguchi. Therefore, the present claims are not anticipated by Taguchi, and not obvious over Taguchi and Ito taken alone or in any combination.

Further, with respect to the dependent claims, Taguchi and Ito are completely silent as to the combinations of features recited in these respective claims. Therefore, the respective claims are not anticipated by Taguchi, and not obvious over Taguchi and Ito taken alone or in any combination.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the rejections should be withdrawn.

In conclusion, the invention as presently claimed is patentable. It is believed that the claims are in allowable condition and a notice to that effect is earnestly requested.

In the event there is, in the Examiner's opinion, any outstanding issue and such issue may be resolved by means of a telephone interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Request for Reconsideration
Serial No. 10/681,384
Attorney Docket No. 032009

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants hereby petition for an appropriate extension of the response period. Please charge the fee for such extension and any other fees which may be required to our Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP



Nicolas E. Seckel
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 44,373

Atty. Docket No. 032009
Customer No.: 38834
1250 Connecticut Avenue NW Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20036
Tel: (202) 822-1100
Fax: (202) 822-1111
NES:rep